



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,587	11/05/2003	Gerald C. Hurley	T3656-8786US01	7582

62574 7590 10/02/2006

SHERIDAN ROSS P C  
SUITE 1200  
1560 BROADWAY  
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

SHERMAN, STEPHEN G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/700,587	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HURLEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen G. Sherman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2629	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed the 5 September 2006.

Claims 1-28 are pending.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

2. The affidavit filed on 5 September 2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Sinha et al. reference.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 20-21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344).

**Regarding claim 1**, Kawada et al. disclose an information display system comprising:

a presentation device capable of displaying a presentation (Figure 5 shows the presenter unit 10 as explained in column 4, lines 15-30.);

a detachable presenter unit that is at least capable being in communication with the presentation device and is at least capable of controlling one or more functions of the presentation device (Figure 5 shows notebook computer 30C, which is detachable from the presenter unit 10, where the notebook computer controls the display created on the presentation device as explained in column 5, lines 15-30.).

Kawada et al. fails to teach that the information display system comprises a presentation device capable of maintaining status information and a messaging system capable of receiving messages from one or more audience members.

Aono et al. disclose of an information display system comprising:

a presentation device capable of maintaining status information (Figure 11 and column 11, line 50 to column 12, line 1.); and

a messaging system capable of receiving messages from one or more audience members (Column 7, lines 32-59 and column 13, lines 63 to column 14, line 41.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the ideas of having a presentation device capable of maintaining status information and receiving messages from the audience as taught by Aono et al. with the information display system taught by Kawada et al. in order to allow for the lecturer to know when his voice is too low and the audience cannot hear him well so that he can continue the lecture with care to speak louder and also so that the lecturer knows how much time is remaining for his speech without looking specifically at a clock or watch.

Kawada et al. and Aono et al. fail to teach that the information display system comprises an environmental control module adapted to adjust one or more environmental controls.

Blaskey et al. disclose of an information display system comprising an environmental control module adapted to adjust one or more environmental controls (Column 4, lines 23-35).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to make the information display system taught by the combination of Kawada et al. and Aono et al. able to adjust environmental controls as taught by Blaskey et al. in order to allow for the brightness of the screen to change in accordance with the light level present in the room such that the screen is easily readable to the presenter.

**Regarding claim 5**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Aono et al. also disclose of a messaging system that receives electronic messages from one or more audience members, one or more of these electronic messages being displayed in a messaging center (Figures 14-15 and column 7, lines 32-59 and column 13, lines 63 to column 14, line 41.).

**Regarding claim 7**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al. also disclose that the system further comprises a presentation loading system adapted to receive one or more presentations from one or more of a recorded media, a wireless transmission, a wired transmission and a rehearsal booth (Figure 5 shows floppy disk drive 35S, i.e. presentation loading system, for inserting a floppy disk, i.e. recorded media.).

**Regarding claim 8**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Blaskey et al. also disclose wherein the presentation device comprises a primary screen and a secondary screen, the primary screen displaying a presenter view and the secondary screen displaying a presentee view (Figure 4 shows that the presenter views the display located on the lectern 50 and that the presentee view the presentation that is projected from projector 54.).

**Regarding claim 10**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Blaskey et al. wherein the environmental controls comprise at least one of lighting controls, temperature controls, shade controls, volume controls, microphone controls, screen controls, fan controls and automated hardware controls (As explained in the rejection of claim 1, Blaskey is able to control the lighting of the display screen, i.e. screen control.).

**Regarding claim 11**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey disclose the system of claim 1.

Aono et al. also disclose the system further comprising a recording system (Column 7, lines 26-31 explain that picture element values of guide diagrams are recorded meaning that the system has a recording system.).

**Regarding claim 20**, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

**Regarding claim 21**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al. also disclose of the system comprising an agenda file organizer adapted to manage one or more documents associated with one or more presentations (Figure 5 shows that the notebook computer 30C is connected to the body 10).

Art Unit: 2629

Notebook computers are well known to have the ability to manage one or more files, i.e. presentations.).

**Regarding claim 26**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al. also disclose the system comprising one or more of an assistance required button, an internet access button, a next slide button, a previous slide button, a skip slide button, video camera controls, webcam controls, telephone controls, remote environment adjustment controls, shortcut mode buttons and speakers notes displayed concurrently with slide information, with the speakers notes not being visible to an audience (Figure 5 shows buttons 11A-11E which control the scroll speed of the screen, the start and stop scroll keys, and the next/preceding page keys.).

6. Claims 2, 14-19, 22-24 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344) and Barwick (US 4,459,114).

**Regarding claim 2**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach that the system further comprises a rehearsal booth that is adapted to emulate one or more functions of the information display system.



Barwick discloses a presentation system which comprises a presentation booth which emulates a function of a information display system (Figure 1 and column 6, lines 4-62 explain that the booth 10 can display a presentation in which the trainee can practice communicating with a target personality.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a booth as taught by Barwick for use with the presentation system as taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. such that the presenter of the presentation could practice their presentation before actually performing in front of an audience in order to aide the presenter in developing a flexible verbal presentation for different audiences, problems and circumstances.

**Regarding claim 14**, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, where the examiner understands that if the system contains all of the items, then when the system is turned on all of the item would be initialized. Furthermore, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach of practicing a presentation in a presentation emulation device.

Barwick discloses of practicing a presentation in a presentation booth (Figure 1 and column 6, lines 4-62 explain that the booth 10 can display a presentation in which the trainee can practice communicating with a target personality.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a way of practicing a presentation as taught by

Art Unit: 2629

Barwick for use with the presentation method as taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. such that the presenter of the presentation could practice their presentation before actually performing in front of an audience in order to aid the presenter in developing a flexible verbal presentation for different audiences, problems and circumstances.

***Regarding claim 15***, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

***Regarding claim 16***, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

***Regarding claim 17***, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

***Regarding claim 18***, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

***Regarding claim 19***, Kawada et al., Aono et al., Blaskey et al. and Barwick disclose the method of claim 14.

Kawada et al. also disclose the method further comprising controlling aspects of the presentation with the remote presenter unit (Figure 5 shows notebook computer 30C, which is detachable from the presenter unit 10, where the notebook computer controls the display created on the presentation device as explained in column 5, lines 15-30.).

**Regarding claim 22**, please refer to the rejection of claim 2, and furthermore Barwick discloses that the device uses hardware or software to implement its functions (Column 4, lines 29-65 explain that hardware is used in the booth.).

**Regarding claim 23**, Kawada et al., Aono et al., Blaskey et al. and Barwick disclose the system of claim 22. The examiner understands that since Blaskey et al. disclose that the lectern includes a transmitter for the actuation of a further piece of apparatus such as a projector or an audio system, (See abstract and column 7, lines 54-66.) that given the combination of reference, the booth would also be able to receive/transmit a presentation from a remote location.

**Regarding claim 24**, Kawada et al., Aono et al., Blaskey et al. and Barwick disclose the system of claim 22. The examiner understands that the references taken in combination would result in the booth being remote from the system where the presentation is actually given.

**Regarding claim 27**, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 2.

**Regarding claim 28**, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1, 21 and 23.

7. Claims 3-4, 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344) and Tafoya et al. (US 6,411,988).

**Regarding claim 3**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach that the system comprises a broadcasting system that is capable of distributing the presentation to a plurality of locations.

Tafoya et al. disclose a system comprising a broadcasting system that is capable of distributing a presentation to a plurality of locations (Figure 2A and column 5, lines 35-50.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the idea of broadcasting the presentation to a plurality of locations as taught by Tafoya et al. with the information system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. in order to allow for all of the audience members to view the presentation on their own portable computers.

**Regarding claim 4**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey fail to teach that the system comprises one or more profiles that specify a particular set of environmental controls.

Tafoya et al. disclose a system comprising one or more profiles that specify a particular set of environmental controls (Figure 1D shows that there is a profile for controlling the screen and for tools.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the idea of having environmental controls controlled by the presenter's computer as taught by Tafoya et al. with the information system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. in order to allow for the presenter to control when the slides are changed, what is transmitted to the audience, etc.

***Regarding claim 9***, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach that the system comprises a distributed network access device.

Tafoya et al. disclose a system comprising a distributed network access device (Figure 2A shows that there are multiple connections of the computers which means that there is a distributed network device.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the idea of broadcasting the presentation to a plurality of locations as taught by Tafoya et al. with the information system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. in order to allow for all of the audience members to view the presentation on their own portable computers.

**Regarding claim 12**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey fail to teach wherein the environmental control module utilizes an identification scheme to identify specific environmental controls.

Tafoya et al. disclose a system comprising environmental control module that utilizes an identification scheme to identify specific environmental controls (Figure 1D shows that the environment is controllable by the presenter and the examiner understands that if the presenter clicks on the next slide button or the send slide button, that the computer will be able to identify these clicks from each other to determine what action is to be taken.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the idea of having environmental controls controlled by the presenter’s computer as taught by Tafoya et al. with the information system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. in order to allow for the presenter to control when the slides are changed, what is transmitted to the audience, etc.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344) and Chaves et al. (US 2003/043110).

**Regarding claim 6**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach of the system further comprising one or more of an active or passive pointing stylus.

Chaves et al. disclose of a portable device which uses a stylus (Figure 2 and paragraph [0021] explain that the stylus 238 can be used in conjunction with the system to allow the user to navigate through applications or windows easily.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a stylus as taught by Chaves et al. for use with the information system as taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. such that a stylus could be used to provide input into the portable computer in order to allow for the more precise input of information into the presenter computer.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344) and Nelson et al. (US 2003/0005092).

**Regarding claim 13**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach of the system further comprising a detachable presenter locating device.

Nelson et al. disclose of a portable computer locating device (Paragraph [0018] explains that there is a system which can be used to locate a portable computer 112 connected to the internet.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the location device and method as taught by Nelson et al. with the information system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. in order to allow for the location of the portable presentation device should the device be stolen or lost.

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawada et al. (US 5,373,333) in view of Aono et al. (EP 0 286 413 A2) and further in view of Blaskey et al. (US 5,606,344) and Stewart (US 6,504,706).

**Regarding claim 25**, Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. fail to teach that the system comprises a personal digital assistant in communication with and adapted to control the information display system.

Stewart discloses of a system comprising a personal digital assistant in communication with and adapted to control the system (Column 14, lines 17-18.).



Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to make the remote control of the system taught by the combination of Kawada et al., Aono et al. and Blaskey et al. a PDA as taught by Stewart in order to increase the functionality of the remote control to allow for a more versatile control device.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2629

SS

26 September 2006

AMR A. AWAD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Amr A. Awad", with a large, sweeping flourish extending from the end of the signature.